1	without impinging on the franchise, and determining
2	whether that opinion was still good law today or
3	whether it was subject to change.
4	Q. Do you recall a discussion that if a second
5	brand operation appeared to be desirable and the
. 6	Kramer memo was still good law
. 7	MR. WALLINGFORD: Well, wait a minute.
8	MR. HOLSTEAD: Let me finish my
9	question.
10	MR. WALLINGFORD: Okay.
11	Q. [Mr. Holstead] and the Kramer memo was
12	still good law, that the way to get around the problem
13	was limit second brand operations to corporate cities
14	and not do any second brand operations in licensee
15	cities? Because that appears to me what Item 4 is
16	saying.
17	A. Well, I don't have a specific independent
18	recollection at the moment, but it's probable that
19	that was one of the alternatives that was discussed.
20	Q. All right. Was that alternative ever
21	implemented, that Avis under any guise would start a
22	second brand operation in a corporate city? Exhibit
23	A. No, not that I'm aware of. Page 31 of 95
24	Q. Okay. They were just put on hold and died
25	while you were at Avis? A 45420

1	A. Well, I don't know that we ever implemented any
2	second brand operation.
3	Q. Okay. Mr. Schaffer, on over a page or two,
.4	still under the date 1-6-81, the top reference is
5	"Wizard." And down the page is a reference to Alaska.
6	Can you read that, or has that been blanked out?
7	A. Yeah, I can read it. I haven't read it, but I
8	can read it.
9	Q. Why don't you read it, please.
10	(Pause)
11	A. I've read it.
12	Q. All right. In summary, what these notes tell
13	me is that the Alaska license was issued in 1965
14	before statehood, had been further amended, there were
15	no provisions in it for any payments to the
16	Advertising Trust, that Avis had received five percent
17	of time and mileage from the Alaska licensee's rental
18	operations but they never put any part of those monies
19	into the Advertising Trust, that that amounted to
20	#180,000 a year back to 1965.
21	And down towards the very bottom, "Should pay
22	to trust on basis of 3.93 contribution with 1.07 going
23	to licensee relations.* Page 32 of 95
24	And there's some other references in there.
25	But you recall that discussion? A 45421

EXHIBIT D

Exhibit ______ Page 33 of 95

THE ADVERTISING & POLICY

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

COMMITTEE OF AVIS RENT-

A-CAR SYSTEM, ET AL

HARRIS COUNTY, T E X A S

AVIS RENT-A-CAR SYSTEM, INC., ET AL

JUDICIAL DISTRICT 270TH

8 APPEARANCES:

> Ms. Paula W. Hinton Vinson & Elkins 3200 First City Tower Houston, Texas 77002 For the Plaintiffs

> Mr. Robert Harrell Fulbright & Jaworski 800 MBank Building liouston, Texas 77002 For the Defendants

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

٠5

10

11

12

13

14

VS.

ORAL DEPOSITION OF BARRY R. SHAPIRO,

produced at the instance of the plaintiffs in the abovestyled cause on the 18th day of October, 1985, before Bill McFerron, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, at the offices of Avis World Headquarters, 900 Old Country Road, Garden City, New York, in accordance with the stipulations hereinafter set forth.

24

25

```
Committee?
2
          I believe so.
3
    Q
         Did you leave that at Avis when you left Avis?
    Α
         Yes, ma'am.
5
    Q
         What sort of materials, if you recall, would you
         receive?
                    Studies, reports, agendas?
6
         I think it would typically be agendas and reports
    Α
8
         that were intended for delivery to the committee.
9
    Q
         Okay.
10
11
                         (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 110 marked
12
                         for identification.)
13
14
    BY MS. HINTON:
15
         Who is Kenneth Goodkind?
16
         Ken Goodkind is an attorney who reported to me.
17
    Q
         I'd like you to review this memo, please, sir.
18
         Okay. I'd like to make a telephone call.
19
                         MR. HARRELL:
                                        Let's go off the.
20
               record.
21
22
                         (Recess)
23
24
    BY MS. HINTON:
25 -
         Do you think it would be fair to characterize
```

3:03-cv-00029-TMB Document 172-7 Filed 06/19/06

Page 36 of 95

intent behind this memo as predatory? 2 MR. HARRELL: I'm going to object 3 to that question. What does that have to do with anything in this lawsuit? 5 MS. HINTON: We have an allegation 6 of predatory conduct on behalf of the 7 licensor. 8 THE WITNESS: Can I talk to you? 9 MS. HINTON: Please note for the 10 record the witness and Avis' counsel has 11 left the room. 12 13 (Recess) 14 15 MR. HARRELL: Why don't you ask 16 another question, Paula? 17 MS. HINTON: Let me go back and 18 ask the question I asked. 19 Let the record reflect that counsel 20 for Avis and the witness have been gone for, 21 approximately, 20 minutes while discussing 22 these matters that have come up. 23 MR. HARRELL: I don't think it's 24 been 20 minutes, but I will stipulate that 25 we have had an off the record discussion.

BY MS. HINTON:

Showing you once again Plaintiff's Exhibit No.
110. Have you had an opportunity to review that exhibit, Mr. Shapiro?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Do you think it would be fair to characterize the intent behind this memo as predatory?

MR. HARRELL: I'm going to object to the question on a number of grounds, including your characterization of it as being predatory. It's a legal conclusion. He doesn't have to give a legal opinion. But more than anything, I'm going to object to his answering questions about Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 110 because it is clear that this is a legal memorandum and the matters that are discussed in this memorandum are protected by the attorney-client privilege. The memorandum was inadvertently produced.

MS. HINTON: Okay.

BY MS. HINTON:

Q Mr. Shapiro, do you refuse to answer my question?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Are you relying on advice of Avis' counsel?

A Yes, ma'am.

Page 37 of 95

MS. HINTON: Please certify that question. And let the record reflect that 3 this document was produced by the defendants and is noted as NYOll9, Document Number 1456, 5 and this does not appear on the defendants' privileged list. 6 BY MS. HINTON: 7 8 Mr. Shapiro, what is meant by the subject of 9 off-airport rentals? 10 Α Generally, that means car rental services pro-11 vided by operators who do not hold concessions 12 from the airport authority to maintain the 13 counter and facility on the airport. 14 Was Avis ever considering -- Let me put it this 15 way. Strike that question. 16 Does Avis have any off-airport rental 17 locations? 18 Yes, ma'am. 19 Why was Avis looking at off-airport rental locations in licensee territories? 20 MR. HARRELL: Sorry? 22 MS. HINTON: If you have an 23 objection, just state it and I'll certify 24 the question. 25 Please let the record reflect that

Exhibit

Defendants' attorney and the witness left the room once again.

(Recess)

THE WITNESS: Could I have the question again, please?

MS. HINTON: Would you please read back the question?

(Question read)

The corporation was looking at off-airport rental locations not only in licensee territories, it was looking at off-airport rental locations everywhere.

Off-airport operators are typically cut-rate operators and don't provide the full range of services that the major car rental companies and their licensees provide on-airport, and indeed off-airport, as well. And the corporation considered the desirability of forming an off-airport car rental division, if you will, operating under a name other than Avis, which would provide a service not provided -- or would

service a market not served by the corporation or its licensees. And the corporation studied this issue and for a variety of reasons, one of the principal reasons was the corporation's desire not to take any steps which would violate its licensees' rights or would prejudice their operations, the corporation decided that it would not proceed with an off-airport car rental program.

BY MS. HINTON:

- Was the fact that the corporation decided not to,

 I believe you said, infringe on its licensees the
 only reason they decided not to go into the
 off-airport rental operation?
- A I don't know if it was the only reason. It was certainly a reason.
- Was that the reason why they decided not to establish those off-airport rental locations in licensee territories?
- A I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.
- Q Was this reason applicable to the decision with respect to licensee territories and off-airport rental locations?
- A It could have been. I mean this -- Let me think.

 I really can't answer that question.

Exhibit >

Case 3:03-cv-00029-TMB Document 172-7pagied 10/10/08 52aga 1452/20